



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,662	11/26/2003	Keith Gocowski	02-065-KG	5143
7590 LAMBERT & ASSOCIATES SUITE 200 92 STATE ST BOSTON, MA 02109			EXAMINER MISLASZEK, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/30/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
3  
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

7  
8 *Ex parte* KEITH GOCLOWSKI  
9

10  
11 Appeal 2009-006885  
12 Application 10/722,662  
13 Technology Center 3600  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 *Before* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, ANTON W. FETTING, and  
19 JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

20  
21 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

22  
23  
24 DECISION ON APPEAL<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a Final Rejection of claims 1 and 3-8. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

Appellant invented systems and methods for vehicle auctions augmented by the use of computer systems and networks (Spec. 2:11-12).

Independent claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

1. An interactive vehicle auction and sale system comprising:
  - a plurality of computers;
  - a computer network enabling communication between said plurality of computers;
  - a plurality of user interface terminals in connection with said computer network, said terminals utilized to display an amount of auction and sales information and to input a series of auction bids;
  - a plurality of databases and corresponding database servers for storage of an amount of vehicle statistics;
  - an input computer in communication with said network to receive and to route said amount of auction and sales information to a plurality of database servers;
  - a web server in communication with said plurality of user interface terminals and said plurality of database servers, through said network, said web server utilized to control said vehicle auction and sale system, coordinate said series of auction bids and maintain communications between said plurality of user interface terminals and a plurality of servers;
  - an applications server in communication with said network and said user interface

terminals; said applications server containing a system software program for operating said interactive vehicle auction and sale system; a vehicle image and video server in communication with said network and said user interface terminals, containing a plurality of electronic vehicle images and a plurality of vehicle video media to be accessed by said user terminals; a template server in communication with said network and said user interface terminals, containing a plurality of templates to be accessed by said user interface terminals in conjunction with said system software program, an amount of data from said template server utilized as a plurality of interactive computer screens; a plurality of mail servers in communication with said network, said plurality of mail servers utilized to receive an amount of auction and sales information from said users; said mail servers also utilized to respond to said users; a plurality of protection mechanisms contained within said network to protect said database servers from unwanted access; a bank system connection in communication with said network to enable verification of a credit line of a vehicle purchaser; and an auction timer, wherein said auction timer controls an amount of time allotted for said interactive vehicle auction and a readout of said timer is displayed on said user interface terminals.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Berent	US 5,774,873	Jun. 30, 1998
Alaia	US 2002/0046148 A1	Apr. 18, 2002
Friedland	US 6,449,601 B1	Sep. 10, 2002

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berent in view of Friedland and Alaia.

We REVERSE.

## ISSUE

Did the Examiner err in asserting that a combination of Berent, Friedland, and Alaia renders obvious a combination of elements including “an auction timer” as recited in independent claim 1 and dependent claim 3?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

Alaia discloses that many systems are biased towards the supplier offering the electronic market. Procurement costs can be further lowered with an unbiased electronic market that promotes competition (para. [0006]).

## ANALYSIS

We are persuaded that the Examiner erred in asserting that a combination of Berent, Friedland, and Alaia renders obvious a combination of elements including “an auction timer” as recited in independent claim 1 and dependent claim 3 (App. Br. 16-21). Even assuming that Alaia discloses an auction timer, the Examiner has not provided a convincing line of reasoning for combining the auction timer of Alaia with Berent and Friedland to render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 1. *See In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The Examiner points to paragraph [0006] of Alaia as providing such reasoning, however, the Examiner has made no findings as to how a bias “towards the supplier offering the electronic market” and lowering

procurement costs with an unbiased, competitive electronic market, makes it obvious to combine an auction timer with the disclosures of Berent and Friedland. *See In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1447 (the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references).

DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1 and 3-8 is reversed.

REVERSED

hh

LAMBERT & ASSOCIATES  
SUITE 200  
92 STATE ST  
BOSTON, MA 02109